

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22103

going abroad. The Johnson visit was said to be an indirect result of this.

In general, besides trying "to enhance, if possible, the already excellent" Finnish-American relations, Mr. Rowan wants to be "aware, and make Washington aware, of any way in which the United States can act to assist the Finns in achieving their fundamental goal" of maintaining their independence.

"This," he said, "may mean doing nothing."

But for a man with a record of vigorous action "doing nothing" appears unlikely.

HYPOCRISY AND ANTI-SEMITISM ACTIVITIES OF ARON VERGELIS

Mr. KEATING. I believe the American people should be alerted to the activities under the cultural exchange program of Aron Vergelis.

Mr. President, among the cultural exchange visitors from the Soviet Union who have been touring the United States was a man sent obviously for the purpose of denying and obscuring the extent of anti-Semitic activities within the Soviet Union. Aron Vergelis, editor of a Yiddish publication in the Soviet Union, has tried to present himself in the United States as a spokesman for the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. Yet it is evident that his purpose is not to give Americans the full truth, not to explain the new trend of persecution and discrimination which fall to the lot of the Jewish people within the Soviet Union, and above all not to serve as a genuine link between the Jews in the Soviet Union and their coreligionists in the free world.

In one statement after another, Mr. Vergelis has tried to deny the obvious facts of discrimination, the closing of synagogues in the Soviet Union, the denial of a Yiddish language press or a cultural rights comparable to those of nationality groups within the Soviet Union. Vergelis has even insisted that "a Jewish problem does not exist in the Soviet Union" and that those who discuss it are only trying to interfere and block peaceful relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I wish that the words of Mr. Vergelis were true and that the rights of Jews and other religious groups in the Soviet Union did receive the respect which is their due. It is, however, only too well documented that Jewish persons in the Soviet Union are being made scapegoats for economic failure of all kinds. Because of a sympathetic and often sentimental tie with the State of Israel, Soviet Jews are often considered disloyal citizens. They dare not give the true story of the discriminations they meet. But it is clear to those who have looked at the mounting evidence that the religious and cultural rights of the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union are gravely threatened. In their continuing battle against all religion, the Soviet Communists have recently exerted special pressures against members of the Jewish faith and have denied to them the human rights which we in the United States regard as basic principles of government and ethics.

Mr. President, the American people are not deceived by the words of Aron

Vergelis. Neither are we seeking to increase tensions between the two countries merely because as citizens of a free nation we see and recognize the facts. But certainly it would be a useful step in the easing of tensions and in the recognition of mutual interests if the Soviet Union would move to correct the injustices that are so clearly evident to the entire world and to insure for all its citizens the rights which it so proudly boasts of before other countries. That would be a step forward, a step that would be welcomed by all free peoples throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, in the Record the text of an article and editorial which appeared in the Jewish press on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Jewish Press, Nov. 29, 1963]

ARON VERGELIS

Aron Vergelis has come to America. Who, you will ask, is Aron Vergelis? If you were to ask the gentleman himself he would modestly say that he is merely a Russian writer here, together with 15 other such worthies, on a 3-week tour of these United States. The man's modesty, however, does not tell the entire picture.

For Aron Vergelis is a famous man these days, a celebrity at least. Because of Aron Vergelis 18 top Jewish leaders met in hasty conclave feverishly to discuss what to do about him. Because of Aron Vergelis, the International Airport at New York was filled with reporters waiting for the Soviet jet that brought him here to land.

But, you impatiently ask, why? Who is this Aron Vergelis? It is a simple question but one which, unfortunately, does not have a simple answer. We could say that Vergelis is a writer, a Soviet journalist, the editor of the only Yiddish magazine in Russia today. It would hardly be the whole story.

We would have to say that Aron Vergelis is a "moser" (an informer) who has been sent here by the Soviet Government to brand all the stories about Soviet Jewish persecution as a "fistful of lies invented by the capitalist ruling circles as part of their cold war strategy." We would have to say that he is sent here to confuse the issues in the minds of the Jewish peoples. We would have to quote you from one or two of his remarks upon arriving.

Thus, upon being asked why such minute groups as the Gypsies and Yakuts have complete cultural autonomy while the Jews have not, Vergelis quite logically said: "The Jews are already integrated; they are satisfied with a general Jewish culture." Upon being read a quotation from a Soviet journal that read: "What is a Jew's secular god? Money. Money, that is the jealous god of Israel before whom there is no other god," Vergelis coolly replied: "I read it and it does not bother me in the least. It is not the kind of Judaism I believe in that is being described in those articles."

And so, while the yeshivas in Russia are still closed and the synagogues diminish in number; while the physical well-being of the people is threatened and the spiritual life is being destroyed, Vergelis comes to deny it all.

Who—or what—is Aron Vergelis? We leave it to you, dear readers, to tell us.

MOSCOW EDITOR SAYS NO ANTI-SEMITISM IN RUSSIA

NEW YORK.—Aron Vergelis, editor of the Sovietish Heimland published in Moscow, and Robert Rozhdestvensky, a prominent Soviet poet, asserted here this week with

great heat that there was no anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, the latter insisting "a Jewish problem does not exist in the Soviet Union" and those in this country who say so are interested only in "interfering with the relaxation of tensions" between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Vergelis and the Russian poet were members of a three-man group of Russians who held a press conference at the headquarters of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations. Most of the questions directed at the group, which was headed by another well-known Russian writer, Boris Polovoi, concerned the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union.

Both Mr. Vergelis and Rozhdestvensky avoided direct answers in regard to closures of synagogues by Soviet authorities and denial to the Jews of the Soviet Union cultural rights. However, Mr. Vergelis did produce for the television cameras and other photographers a large colorful poster announcing in Russian a performance by Yiddish artists and said that there are more Jewish theatrical performances in the Soviet Union than there are in the United States. Challenged about the high percentage of Jews given the death sentence for alleged economic crimes in the Soviet Union, Mr. Vergelis said that the victims were sentenced merely as criminals and that no anti-Semitism was involved.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—HOUSE AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703 to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of yesterday, the Senate will now resume the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1703, the Mexican laborer bill.

The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to concur in the House amendment, upon which 30 minutes of debate is permitted, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has requested a quorum call. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side on the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that my request be modified accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be modified accordingly.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I speak briefly in support of the motion made yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. His motion would call for the adoption by the Senate of the

22104

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 4

bill as passed by the House, which would extend the operation of the Mexican labor act, or the bracero act, for 1 year only, from December 31, 1963, to December 31, 1964.

The Senate, by a single vote margin, adopted the McCarthy amendment, which was the amendment omitted by the House in the passage of its bill.

The House had the same subject before it—that is, the McCarthy amendment—and it disposed of it in this way: The House Agriculture Committee rejected the McCarthy amendment by a vote of 28 to 4. When the McCarthy amendment was considered on the floor of the House, it was rejected by a division vote of 79 to 131.

The bill as passed by the House calls for an extension of 1 year only, without the McCarthy amendment.

Statements were made on the floor of the House to the effect that 1 year would be the limit of the extension to be expected by those who are using Mexican braceros for the production and harvesting of their perishable crops.

I understand that the distinguished chairman of the Senate committee stated yesterday on the Senate floor that, so far as he and his committee are concerned, their commitment is to an extension of 1 year, and not beyond that time.

Without laboring the question, let me make two points. First, this program is one requested by the Mexican Government itself. I served in the Senate committee when this solution was arrived at. The Mexican Government wanted it done this way because it said that under the old program Mexican laborers moved, too frequently, from communities which had no problem of unemployment. The Mexican Government wanted to have the right to select the laborers who would come to this country from areas of unemployment, therefore to have charge of the selection and handling of their people.

That purpose was accomplished under this program. It was not accomplished under the former program. It will not be accomplished by the program which will be left on the books after this program ceases to exist.

As I have stated, therefore, first, the Mexican Government wanted this program. It gives the Mexican Government an opportunity to send laborers from areas where acute unemployment exists in their own country, and to know that their people will be fairly treated.

Secondly, we must consider the need for these laborers in our country. Despite the fact that the number of such laborers has greatly decreased in the last year about 200,000 of them came into areas producing perishable fruit and commodities, and some other commodities, but mostly perishable commodities, to help, in the main, in the cultivation and harvesting of highly seasonal and perishable crops, which must be harvested at the time they mature.

We are now in the middle of a harvesting year and a production year, depending on the area in which these laborers are employed, because they are employed from Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, just outside Mexico, up through Colorado, Arkansas,

and Michigan, where last year some seven or eight thousand were employed in harvesting the pickle crop.

I do not think it is fair even to think about eliminating this program and eliminating the possibility of the use of 200,000 laborers by those who have to depend upon obtaining laborers when they need them, when the crops are ready to be handled, and when they are doing that at this very moment in part of the area represented by the Senators from Arizona—and I see present the distinguished senior Senator [Mr. HAYDEN]—and by the Senators from California, who are interested in this program, and by the Senators from Texas, who are vitally interested in this program.

Mr. President, in my own State we do not use these particular laborers. We use, at times, laborers from the offshore islands under an entirely different arrangement, under which we pay much more than is paid in the case of Mexican laborers.

It would be very burdensome and difficult for the thousands of affected farmers to solve the problem in such a short time. Passage of the bill with the McCarthy amendment added to it would not solve the problem. I strongly support the pending motion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I spoke at some length on this subject matter last night, and today I wish to make only two or three points, and to offer those points for the consideration of Senators.

First of all, I appreciate the position of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], who opposes the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

I am sure he does so in all sincerity. However, I say to him and to other Senators who are in his position that the senior Senator from Colorado would not presume to judge the conditions in Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, or any State other than my own. I hope that they will accord to those of us who are involved in this matter the same courtesy and the same consideration.

The main issue, so far as the Senator from Minnesota is concerned, is whether the Senate will accept the motion made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, or whether it will adopt the amendment which was in the Senate bill originally.

First of all, this is only a simple 1-year extension; and it would be a physical impossibility for the Secretary of Labor, within the 1-year extension, to put into effect the workmen's compensation provision, which must come under State laws, and implement the other conditions and provisions of the McCarthy amendment, before the expiration of the Act.

Therefore, in effect, the Senate would be indulging in an exercise in futility if it did not accept the motion made by the Senator from Louisiana.

The question has been repeatedly raised: What kind of program is this?

I wish again to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that three main conditions must be met by the Secretary of

Labor—not by the farmer in the field, not by the hometown, not by the State—but by the Secretary of Labor, before braceros may be imported.

The first condition is that it must be found by the Secretary that there are not sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I request that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. The second qualification that must be met is that the Secretary of Labor must determine that employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and the working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

The third qualification is that reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Mr. President, there are many articles which I should like to include in the Record. However, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be printed in the Record an article entitled "Bracero Program Is Vital Part of State's Agricultural Economy," published in the Centennial State Farm Bureau News; excerpts from the testimony of Robert M. Sayre before the House Agriculture Committee; and questions and answers concerning the Mexican national program.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Centennial State Farm Bureau News, July-August 1963]

BRACERO PROGRAM IS VITAL PART OF STATE'S AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

The importance of Public Law 78 to the sugarbeet, lettuce and vegetable segments of Colorado's agricultural industry was emphasized by both producers and processors at a meeting with four members of the State's congressional delegation in Denver on June 21.

At a meeting arranged by Farm Bureau with Senators ALLOTT and DOMINICK and Representatives BROTZMAN and CHENOWETH, both growers and processors outlined the need for continuation of the Mexican bracero program.

The situation was summed up in a very few words by George Bensheld of the Arkansas Valley when he told the Senators and Representatives that without this source of labor the vegetable industry in Colorado "has had it."

Unless Congress acts to reverse the vote cast in the House of Representatives late in May, Public Law 78 will expire at the end of this year. The proposed extension of the law was defeated on May 29, described by Representative CHENOWETH as very bad day to try to get serious consideration of the proposed legislation to extend the program.

Being the day before a holiday, many of the Members of the House were absent. The total vote on the measure was 158 to 174.

CHENOWETH pointed out that all but one member of Colorado's delegation in the House worked hard to save the law in the House.